

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application in view of the amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 2, 13 and 14 were previously canceled. Claims 1 and 12 have been amended. Claim 18 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Six claims are pending in the application: claims 1, 3 and 12, and 15-17.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

1. Claims 1, 3, 12 and 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Marmel, Elaine, Microsoft Project 2000 Bible, Chapter 17 – “Coordinating Multiple Projects” (IDG Books Worldwide, Inc., 2000) (referred to herein as “Microsoft Project”).

Microsoft Project discloses a program that can consolidate smaller projects into one larger project. When a subproject is created, it is saved as a separate project file. This allows for creation separate projects for small parts of a larger project. When the big picture is desired to be viewed, the subprojects are consolidated into one large project (*See* page 456 of Microsoft Project).

Starting on page 466 under the section entitled “Consolidated Project and Dependencies,” Microsoft Project discloses linking tasks across subprojects that have been consolidated into one large project. In a consolidated project you typically have tasks—either in the consolidated project or in one subproject—that are dependent on tasks in another subproject. You can create links between projects in a consolidated file, and if necessary, you can change the links you create. Fig. 17-2 shows the display of the “Buy Room Decorations” task that is part of “subproject2” however this task is displayed when accessing “subproject1.” Thus, the “Buy Room Decorations” is called an external task within Microsoft Project and is linked to a task within “subproject1.”

Page 467 of Microsoft Project recites:

When you link tasks between projects, the task links look like standard links in the consolidated project. However, as Figure 17-12 shows, when you open either of the subproject files, you'll see that Project has inserted an external link. The name and the Gantt Chart bar of each externally linked task appear gray. If you point at the Gantt Chart bar, Project displays information about the task, including that it is an external task (emphasis added).

The Examiner states on page 2 of the Advisory Action that Microsoft Project “displays external tasks in different colors.” The Examiner states that Figures 17-3 through 17-6 and Figure 17-12 clearly show external tasks displayed in a different color. However, these Figures show all of the tasks in gray, regardless of being internal or external tasks. That is, the color gray is not used to distinguish an external task from any other task or to mark the task as an external task. In looking at the External task shown in Figure 17-12, the “task name” menu for the external task is shown in a different shade of gray than that of the internal tasks. However, the “task name” menu is not part of the actual program management chart.

What is taught by Microsoft Project is that “when you link tasks between projects, the task links look like standard links in the consolidated project.” The task name in the color gray is used to distinguish the external task from the internal tasks. Furthermore, by moving the mouse over the external task, a box appears that states that the task is an external task. Thus, the tasks appear the same (i.e., look like a standard link) as other tasks in the project, however a user can look to the “task name” menu or operate a mouse to distinguish an internal task from an external task.

In contrast, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite “wherein a shape of the task that is outside of the selected set of data is used to differentiate the task that is outside of the selected set of data from the plurality of tasks within the selected set of data.” Advantageously, this allows a user of the program management chart to be able to quickly visually differentiate between a task that is outside of the selected set of data and the plurality of tasks within the selected set of data without having to look to a menu or to move a mouse over the task in order to have a box appear. Thus, a user is able to differentiate between the tasks only by looking at

the program management chart and does not have to take further action with a mouse or look to a menu structure and then attempt to locate the task within the program management chart that is associated with the differently colored menu entry. Applicants claimed invention is a substantial improvement over the teachings of Microsoft Project where a user must look outside of the program management chart to a menu structure or must actively move the mouse over a task to get more information about the task.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Microsoft Project does not teach or suggest “differentiating within the program management chart between the plurality of tasks within the selected set of data and the task that is outside of the selected set of data; wherein a shape of the task that is outside of the selected set of data is used to differentiate the task that is outside of the selected set of data from the plurality of tasks within the selected set of data” such as is recited in amended claim 1. Thus, Applicants submit the rejection is overcome and claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Claim 3 is also in condition for allowance at least because of its dependency upon claim 1.

Similarly, Applicants have amended claim 12 to recite “differentiating between the plurality of tasks that are part of the project and associated with the subset of data and the task that part of the project and is outside of the subset of data; wherein a shape of the task that part of the project and is outside of the subset of data is used to differentiate the task that part of the project and is outside of the subset of data from the plurality of tasks that are part of the project and associated with the subset of data.” For at least the same reasons as stated above with reference to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Microsoft Project does not disclose each and every element of amended claim 12 and thus does not anticipate claim 12. Claims 15-17 are in condition for allowance at least because of their dependency upon claim 12.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit the rejection is overcome and all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

By way of this amendment, Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. Should there remain any outstanding issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Thomas F. Lebens at (805) 781-2865 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

/Martin R. Bader/

Martin R. Bader
Reg. No. 54,736

Dated: April 18, 2006

Address all correspondence to:

Thomas F. Lebens
FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY
120 So. LaSalle Street, Ste. 1600
Chicago, IL 60603